

Serial No. 10/715,853  
Amendment dated May 31, 2005  
In Reply of Office Action dated March 24, 2005

**REMARKS**

Counsel for the Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to Examiner Mark T. Henderson for the objective and clear Office Action.

In response to the Examiner's objections, new claims are submitted to avoid the objections raised by the Examiner. New claim 16 although reciting some of the limitations in claim 1 is a much more detailed claim and avoids the art of record by specifically defining the calling card and its exact location which provides a pair of unattached outside connected edges and a pair of attached connected inside perforated edges not shown in Long '149. Long '149 perforates all edges of his information item 17. Furthermore, the new claim specifically positions the map as on the back surface left top, left bottom, right bottom and central sections. This is not shown in Long. Long '149 shows item 17 as inside of an instructional strip 20 which is unperforated as noted in column 3 line 46.

The primary purpose of the particular invention is to provide to the individual receiving the postal mailer a removable calling card which is clean without map information extending on the back surface of the calling card when removed from the

Serial No. 10/715,853

Amendment dated May 31, 2005

In Reply of Office Action dated March 24, 2005

mailer. The map is so designed as to be in the form of an L bordering on the calling card area and not interfering with any surface of the calling card when it is removed.

The arguments relative to indicia which Examiner Henderson presents in the Office Action are appreciated; nevertheless, it is felt that the claimed indicia is functionally related to the substrate particularly in view of the positioning of the indicia on the map which is itself of a specific location and is so designed to enable the informant to provide ready access to the recipient which ordinarily would not be there and is so provided in specific location as to be critical to the aspect of the map in relation to the other information on the map as it relates also to the calling card and its position.

In view thereof it is believed that the dependent claims which relate to the specifics of the indicia should be considered allowable and as they are dependent on claim 16, this case is now believed to be in condition for allowance as it is felt that the claims avoid the art of record whether taken individually or in combination and an early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. It is noted that patents 6,572,149; 5,468,021; and 2,158,486 referenced in this case all have claims including indicia and specific printed information and location thereof.

Serial No. 10/715,853

Amendment dated May 31, 2005

In Reply of Office Action dated March 24, 2005

It is believed that no fee is due for this submission; however, should that determination be incorrect, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies to our Deposit Account No. 19-2105, and notify the undersigned in due course.

Should the Examiner have any questions or wish to discuss further this matter, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 31, 2005

By: B. Edward Shlesinger, Jr.  
B. Edward Shlesinger, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 17,225

SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP  
1420 King Street, Suite 600  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
(703) 684-5600  
sb